

A VIEW OF SOME  
EXCEPTIONS  
TO THE  
PRACTICALL  
Catechisme:

FROM  
The Censures affixt on them by the  
*Ministers of London*, in a Book

ENTITLED,  
[*A Testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ, &c.*]

---

BY  
H. HAMMOND D.D.

---



---

LONDON,  
Printed for Rich: Royston at the Angel in Ivie-lane.





## A view of some Exceptions to the Practicall Catechisme, &c.

Being it again appears to me by a *book*, that came to this town on Saturday last, (entitled, *A Testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ, &c.* pretending to be subscribed by 52 Ministers of Christ within the Province of London) that it is Gods good pleasure to deliver me up to be evil spoken of, and accused, and to bear a yet deeper part of his bitter cup, then many others of my Brethren have done, I desire to blesse and praise his name for this his goodnesse and mercy to me, and to embrace all those, who have joyn'd their hands to be instruments in this, as those whom by *Christs* command (particularly belonging to me on this occasion) I am bound to love, to blesse, to pray for, and not to think of any other way of return toward them. This, I thank God, I can most cheerfully doe, and would satisfie my self to have done it in private, between God and my own soul, were there not another occasion, which makes it a little necessary for me to say somewhat publicly; and that is the vindication of the *truth of Christ Jesus*, which they who are willing to give *testimony* to it, will, I hope, take from me in good part.

These men *pag. 4.* in the beginning of the second branch of their testimony, (which it seems by *pag. 37.* the whole number of the 52 Ministers have subscribed) make mention of *unsound opinions, especially abominable errors, damnable herefies, and horrid blasphemies,*

wies, which are broached and maintained here in England among us, under the notion of New lights, and new truths; many of which they have reason to judge destructive to the very fundamentall truths of Christianity, &c. All of them utterly repugnant to the sacred Scriptures, the occasion of much grief of heart to all the friends of truth and piety at home, the scandal and offence of all the Reformed Churches abroad, the unparalleled reproach of this Church and Nation, totally inconsistent with the Covenant, and the covenanted Reformation, and in a word, the very dregs and spawn of those old accursed heresies which have been already condemned, &c.

After this preface and expression of their zeale to Gods truth, they conclude the period with a profession, that they more particularly abominate these infamous and pernicious errors of late published among us, and hereafter recited in this ensuing Catalogue, viz. Errors, &c.

In this Catalogue, three particulars there are recited from the *Practical Catechisme* of H. Hammond, 2. Edit. London, 1646.

For which premises, I suppose, any Reader will conclude, that those three particulars are by these Ministers thought guilty of all those Charges which they had affixt to *All* the unsound opinions, &c. noted by them, viz. that they are utterly repugnant to the sacred Scriptures, &c. and in the modestest of their expressions, that they are infamous and pernicious errors.

Upon this supposition, I hold it my duty by setting down these three particulars punctually, to referre to all impartiall Christians to judge whether it be a *Testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ* to passe such censures on them.

The first is recited by them, p. 9. and it is this, That Christ was given to undergoe a shamefull death voluntarily upon the Crosse, to satisfie for the sin of Adam, and for all the sins of all mankind.

This is thus plainly set down in their catalogue of infamous and pernicious errors, but without the least note to direct what part of this proposition is liable to that charge, any farther then may be collected from the title of the Errors under which 'tis placed, viz: *Errors touching universall or generall redemption*. From whence I presume to discern their meaning to be. that to affirm Christ to have satisfied for, or redeemed all mankind, is this pernicious error by them abominated. And such I confesse I should acknowledge  
it

it to be, if it had any right to be joyn'd with that other by these men set under the same head [*that the damned shall be saved*] but I hope that error hath received no patronage from that *Catechism*, nor sure from that assertion of *Christs* redeeming all mankind. These two propositions being very reconcilable, that *Christ* redeemed all men, and yet that the whole number of the impenitent, unbeleiving, reprobate world shall never be saved by him. If there were any need of it, I should easily shew the way of reconciling these two, by adding that the great Benefits of *Christs* death, which I affirm to be generall, are given upon condition, not absolutely (as *Gods* love to the world, and, the effect of it, given his Son, is not designed, that all absolutely, but that all conditionally, i.e. *whosoever* beleiveth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life) & that they which doe not perform that condition (as God knows a great multitude doe not) shall never be saved by his death: To which purpose is that of *Prosper*, one farre enough from all kindness to the *Pelagians*, *Redemptor mundi dedit pro mundo sanguinem suum, & mundus redimi noluit, &c.* the Redeemer of the world gave his blood for the world, and the world would not be redeemed. *ad Gal. cap. 9.* But, to confine my discourse (without consideration of the consequences) to the assertion it self; I desire it may be observd, that this was not crudely set down in that *Catechism*, but with this immediate addition [*to tast death for every man, Heb. 2. 9.*] by that plain testimony of Scripture confirming the truth of what was asserted, as punctually as could be imagined. For sure [*every man*] signifies all mankind, as that notes *singulos generis humani*, in the largest notion of the word, and *tasting death* for them is satisfying for their sins. If this testimony (so clear, that it alone hath, to my knowledge, convinc'd one as learned a man as doth in this Church of ours maintain the doctrines contrary to the *Remonstrants*) be not thought sufficient to support this assertion, I shall then *ex abundanti* adde these other plain testimonies; Not onely that of *Gods* giving his onely sonne, mentioned by *Christ* as an effect or expression of his love to the world, (which it would not be, if he did not give him for the world, whom he is said to love) but (to prevent all distinctions concerning the notion of the world, as if it signified, onely the Elect) more particularly these two; First that of *2 Pet. 2. 1.* where the Lord, i.e. *Christ*,

is plainly said to have *bought* (i.e. paid the price, satisfied for) *them*, who deny him, and bring upon themselves swift destruction: to which agrees that of 1 Cor. 8. 11. where the *weak brother*, of whom 'tis said, that by another mans scandal he *shall perish*, is described to be one for whom Christ died. The other testimony which I shall adde, is that of S. Paul, 2 Cor. 5. 14. which I desire the intelligent Reader to observe: Where speaking of the *constraining obliging love of Christ*, he saith, *we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead*, that is, surely, *All* in the full latitude, not only the *elect* but *All others*; and this conclusion the *Apostle* infers by this *medium*, because *one*, i.e. *Christ died for all*, which being a proof of the other, must certainly be as true, and as acknowledged (if not more) as that which 'tis brought to prove: and particularly the [*all*] for whom he *died*, be as unlimited as the [*All*] that were prov'd from thence to be *dead*, or else the *Apostle* could not *judge* (as he saith he doth) or conclude the *death of all in Adam* by that *mediū*. From this arguing of the *Apostle* I shall make no question to infer, that in S. Pauls divinity, *Christ died for all who are dead in Adam*; and on that occasion I shall adde, by the way, that the contrary doctrine [of *Christs* not dying for all] was by the *Antients* affixt on *Pelagius* upon that ground, of his affirming that all (i. e. that Infants) were not faln in *Adam*, and so needed not to be redeem'd by Christ. Thus it appears by S. *Aug: cont. 2. Epist. Pelag: l. 2. c. 2.* *Pelagiani dicunt Deum non esse omnium atatum in hominibus mundatorem, salvatorem, liberatorem, &c.* and when the *Massilians*, to vindicate themselves from that charge of S. *Augustines*, confesse that *Christ died for all mankind*, as it appears by *Prosper Epistle* *Prosper* expresses no manner of dislike of that confession, but formes other charges against them. And the truth is, there is scarce any antient Writer before *Pelagius*, but hath directly asserted *Christs* dying for all, The testimonies of *Irenæus*, *Clemens*, *Origen*, *Macarius*, *Cyrill of Jerusalem*, *Ensebius*, *Athanasius*, and many others might readily be produced, if that were needfull. And then let it be guest also, which of the two positions, the affirmative or the negative, best deserves the charge of being the *spawn of those old accursed heresies, which have been already condemned, &c.* The same I could adde from many the learnedst *Protestants*, which never were thought to be tainted with any antient or modern heresie

heresie (though others I know have exprest themselves otherwise) but I need not such auxiliaries. To conclude this point, I suppose in affirming or vindicating this position, I have born *testimony* to the *truth of Christ*, from whom, and whose Apostles I professe to have learn'd this truth, and to conceive it (for the sense of it) as fully testified by plain Scriptures, as many Articles of the Creed; and for the expression used in the *Pract: Catechisme* of [all mankind] I must acknowledge to have learn'd it from the Church of *England* (of which I doe yet with joy professe my self an obedient son and member) in those words of her *Catechisme*, establish'd by *Act of Parliament*, and inserted in the Book of *Lyturgie*, where I was taught, [*to beleive in God the Father, who created me and all the world, In God the Son, who redeemed me and all mankind, and in God the holy Ghost, who sanctified me and all the elect people of God;* where *mankind* as it is of a narrower extent on one side then all the world of creatures, so is it to be understood of a larger, then all the elect people of God; and so much for the first charge.

The second is set down pag. 15. and it is this. *That neither Paul nor James exclude or separate faithfull actions or acts of faith from faith, or the condition of justification, but absolutely require them, as the only things by which the man is justified.* What is thus set down I acknowledge to be *in terminis* in the *Practical Catechisme*, but cannot easily guesse wherein the errour or perniciousnesse is conceived to lie, unlesse it should possibly be thorow a mistake of the phrase [*the only things by which the man is justified*] as if by that speech should be understood, either that the *faithfull actions or acts of faith without faith it self*, were the *only things by which we are justified*, or else that all the things there spoken of, *Faith*, and *faithfull actions*, or *acts of faith* are the only CAUSE, and so some CAUSE of our *justification*, or by which, as by a CAUSE, we are justified; either of these I confesse might passe for an errour, but both these doctrines I have sufficiently disclaim'd; and indeed in this very proposition 'tis affirm'd that the *faithfull actions or acts of Faith are not excluded or separated from Faith* (which they must be if they justify without *Faith*) or the *condition of justification* (i. e. from that faith which is considered as, and affirm'd to be the condition of our justification) but by those two Apostles absolutely required, to what? Why to *faith, or the condition of our justification,*  
as the



as the only things together with it by which as by a condition, and only so (as 'tis clearly set down all over that part of the *Catechisme*, which handles *Faith* or *Justification*) the man is justified. This I suppose may give these men some light of their mistake, if it were such: but if they understand the speech as then and now I doe, and yet think it error, and pernicious, I must then only prove that what was said from *S. James* and *S. Paul*, was not by me falsely imposed upon them, and then they must either maintain my speech, or fall with me in the same condemnation. That *S. James* doth not exclude or separate faithful actions, or acts of Faith, from Faith, or the condition of Justification, but require them, (i.e. Faith, and faithful actions, or acts of faith) as the only things by which, as by a condition, the man is justified will be clear by the definition of a condition in *Logick*, and the plain words of *S. James*; A Condition is a qualification of the subject required to make him capable, or a *causa sine qua non*; and so a condition of justification is no more, then that without which a man cannot be justified; and that is the direct affirmation of *S. James*, c. 2. 24. *Ye see that by works* (i.e. faithful actions, or acts of faith) *a man is justified, and not by faith only*: and again, *Faith if it have not works*, v. 17. and *Faith without works*, v. 20. is dead, and so sure, not such as by w<sup>ch</sup> we are justified. From whence I form this syllogisme, *That, without which, in S. James's opinion, we are not justified, and by which joyn'd with faith we are justified, not by faith only, is not by S. James excluded or separated from Faith, or the condition of our justification, but required together with Faith, as the only things by which (as by a condition) the man is justified.* But without acts of faith or faithful actions, in *S. James's* opinion, we are not justified, and by them we are justified, and not by faith only, Therefore faithful actions, or acts of Faith are not by *S. James* excluded or separated from Faith, or the condition of our justification, but required together with faith, as the only things by which (as by a condition) the man is justified.

The first proposition is clear from the nature of a Condition; the second from the words cited out of *S. James*, and then I hope the conclusion will neither be error nor pernicious.

Then for *S. Paul* 'tis made evident in the *Pract. Catechism* that the faith by which according to his doctrine *Abraham* was justified (and not by works) *Rom. 4.* was not only a depending on God for



for the performance of his promise (which yet was a *faithfull action*, or *act of Faith*, but also a resigning himself up wholly to him to obey his precepts; or more clearly, was a *Faith*, which, howsoever it was tried by promises or commands, did answer God in *Acts of faith*, or *faithfull actions*; and so was accepted by God (without absolute unfinning obedience, much more without obedience to the *Mosaicall law*, i. e. without *works*) all which is clear in the story of *Abraham*, and I suppose need not farther be evidenced. And then concerning *S. Pauls* part in the businesse, my syllogisme shall be this, *He that affirms Abraham to be justified by that Faith, which, howsoever 'twas tried, did answer God in acts of faith or faithfull actions, doth not exclude or separate faithfull actions or acts of faith from faith, or the condition of our justification, but absolutely requires them, &c.* But *S. Paul* affirms *Abraham* to be justified by that faith, which howsoever 'twas tried, did answer God in faithfull actions, or acts of faith, Therefore *S. Paul* doth not exclude or separate faithfull actions, &c. The first proposition I conceive wants little proving, after that which hath been already premised in this matter. And for the second I shall desire that *Abrahams faith*, as it hath justification attributed to it by *S. Paul*, may be viewed both in the 4<sup>th</sup> to the *Rom.* and the 11<sup>th</sup> to the *Heb.* In the former his faith was tried by the promise of a numerous seed, &c. and he answered that with one *act of faith*, or *faithfull action*, beleived in hope, beyond hope, v. 18. was strong in faith and gave glory to God, v. 20. was fully perswaded, that what God had promised, he was able to perform, v. 21. all which what are they but *acts of faith*, or *faithfull actions*; all, which (when the object of the faith is Gods absolute promise) the matter is capable of, and for this it was counted to him for righteousness, or he was justified, v. 22. and thence sure I may conclude, that these were so required, as the condition by which he was, and without which he should not be justified. In the 11<sup>th</sup> to the *Heb.* many other *acts of his faith or faithfull actions* are mentioned, v. 8. By faith he obeyed to goe out of his own country, not knowing whither he went, and v. 9. by faith he sojourn'd in a strange land, v. 10. by faith he expected a city, that hath foundations, v. 17. by faith he offered his Son, and v. 19. counted that God was able to raise him up from the dead, v. 20. by faith he blessed *Isaac* concerning

ning things to come. What are all these but acts of faith, or faithfull actions in all kinds of tryals? And therefore I suppose all this being out of S. Paul, as the former out of S. James, 'twill be no error or pernicious from their very words to have affirm'd this doctrine, and affix it on them. I suppose also this may serve for the second proposition.

Edit. II<sup>r</sup>.

but p. 136.

Edit. V<sup>r</sup>.

An. 1649.

The third is set down p. 18. from *Pract. Catech.* p. 120. and 'tis this, That [*Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain*] is undoubtedly no more then [*thou shalt not forswear thy self.*] To this Charge I answer first, that it is a little strange, that a bare explication of a phrase of Scripture, a part of the third Commandment in *Exod.* though it were acknowledged false, or forc'd, should yet be so farre improvable by any, as to come under the title of an infamous pernicious error, a spawn of the old accursed heresies, &c. and be capable of all those other aggravations at first mentioned, which being affixt to all the errors in the Catalogue, must also be affixt to this which is set down for one of them.

But then secondly, for the truth, (most undoubted certain truth) of this explication, or interpretation, thus censured, I have formerly at large made it appear, that the words [*to take the name of God*] signifie to swear, and no more, and the Hebrew which we render in vain, signifies [*falsely*] and is so rendred in the ninth Commandment, and agreeable to that, *Psal. 15. to lift up the soul to vanity*, is to swear by the soul or life falsely, as it there followes, *nor sworn to deceive his neighbour*, and beside my own judgment in this matter, back'd with the consent of as learned as this age hath, or the Antient Church had any, I conceived that I had a most authentick warrant from Christ himself, who renders it in *εὐνομίαις*, *thou shalt not forswear thy self*: For so we read *Mat. 5. Ye have heard that it was said to them of old, thou shalt not kill*, and again in the same manner, *thou shalt not commit adultery*, that is, that of the ten Commandments delivered in *Sinai*, and brought down by Scripture, to them his present auditors, one Commandment was, *thou shalt not kill*, another, *thou shalt not commit adultery*, and so again in the very same form of words, another, *Thou shalt not forswear thy self*, from which I did assure my self (and so still doe) that in *εὐνομίαις*, is as directly the interpretation

terpretation (in Christs judgment) of the first part of the third Commandment, as *ἡ πρώτη*, or *ἡ πρώτη* of the seventh and sixth, and so that it is *undoubtedly no more* the one then the other. And indeed this was the only occasion of delivering those words in the *Practicall Catech:* to shew that Christ did not misreport the words of the Commandements, nor yet referre to any other place but that Commandment in those words of his. And though I have many other things, that I could say to that matter, able to free that speech from all imaginable inconveniences (especially when in that place Christs prohibition is explain'd to be against all kind of swearing (by any other as well as by God) in ordinary conversation, or in any case but wherein it is necessary to confirm by oath) yet I am very willing to leave the matter here, upon this account at this time given of it, *&c.* in my opinion on Christs score, and not fear what any ingenuous Reader will charge on me for this interpretation.

I beseech God to forgive them which have brought this unnecessary trouble upon the Reader; and for my self I have to them these two only requests, 1. That they will examine themselves sincerely, and as in Gods sight, what the motive or design was, which perswaded them to single out me alone (who profess myself, and am by all that know me acknowledged to hold nothing contrary to the Church of *England*, and will justify it to any man that knows what the Church of *England* is) and joyn me with the Broachers of all the blasphemies and heresies of this age: And 2<sup>ly</sup>, that they will lay to heart the consequences which may naturally flow from hence, if God doe not uphold weak Christians, who seeing so many doctrines of very distant natures blended together, with the same brand of [*heresie and blasphemy, infamous and pernicious*] fastned on them, and no kind of proofs annext, that any are such (beside the judgment of the Censors) may possibly find some of them to be the infallible truths of God, and be tempted (if they have not stronger antidotes then this bare *Testimony* will afford them) to have the same thoughts of the other also; Or if not, whether they will not be inclined to have the same severity and condemnation for me, or any other Asserter of such propositions as these, as they are taught to have for the Authors of those other *blasphemous* propositions, and so be tempted to uncharitable benesse.

Having said thus much, I shall hope it may find some good success among some who have subscribed that *Testimony* : But if I am mistaken in all of them, I shall then desire that this prosperous Paper may gain me but thus much, that either the first subscriber Mr. *John Downam* (who did License the Printing of this very Book, from whence all these pretended Errours are cited) or else Dr. *Gouge*, or Mr. *Gataker*, who are foremost of the second rank, or some other person of learning and Christian temper will afford me their patience personally, and by fair Discourse, or any other Christian way, to debate the truth of our pretensions ; And for this I shall wait their leisure.

*From my study, Christ-Ch: in Oxon.*  
Jan. 24. Munday.

H. HAMMOND.

---

THE END.

